



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,047	01/14/2004	Heinrich Kladders	01-1449	4842
28501 7590 02/18/2010 MICHAEL P. MORRIS BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM USA CORPORATION 900 RIDGEBURY ROAD P. O. BOX 368 RIDGEFIELD, CT 06877-0368				
EXAMINER DOUGLAS, STEVEN O				
ART UNIT 3771		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/18/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO.e-Office.rdg@boehringer-ingelheim.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/757,047

Applicant(s)

KLADDERS ET AL.

Examiner

/Steven O. Douglas/

Art Unit

3771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-16 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-16 and 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 November 2007 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, *the elevations in the form of one or more of, ribs with sharp edges, ribs with soft undulating transitions, form of pins* or combinations thereof must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or

the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1,6-13,16 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohki et al. (US 5,715,811).

The Ohki et al. reference discloses an inhaler apparatus (see FIG. 8) that works based on the Bernoulli effect or principle (i.e. venturi effect) including an upper chamber (proximate reference numeral 1 in FIG. 8) and a lower housing part 6 with a capsule chamber (proximate reference numeral 7 in FIG. 8) having a cutting device 14 with spikes 16 and air inlet openings 8

and air outlet openings 8C to conduct a powder composition contained within capsule 17. The capsule 17 (see FIG.8 and FIG. 7) appears to be a symmetrical capsule made up of two parts telescopically pushed together (i.e. such capsules are conventionally made up of two parts telescopically pushed together leaving an associated seam) and the fine structures of any seam or elements of the capsule appear to be smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees (i.e. these are conditions met by a simple capsule that is manufactured within close tolerances). Furthermore, any fine structures of any seam would have a plurality of elevations associated therewith, even the smallest of fine structures would have a plurality of elevations depending on what scale or fine measurement the elevations are measured in.

In regard to claim 22, the elevations are in the form of an annular rib formed by the interface created by the two parts of the capsule telescopically pushed together).

Claims 1,6-16 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hochrainer et al. (US 5,947,118).

The Hochrainer et al. reference discloses an inhaler apparatus (see FIG. 6) that works based on the Bernoulli effect or principle (i.e. venturi effect) comprising a cup shaped lower part open at (6) hinged to cap 15, a plate 8, a button 10 movable counter to a spring 11 and including spikes (unlabeled in FIG. 6). The inhaler apparatus further includes a capsule chamber accommodating a capsule (unlabeled in FIG. 6) and a magazine with a plurality of chambers 1 shown on plate 8. The capsule (see FIG. 6) appears to be a symmetrical capsule made up of two parts telescopically pushed together (i.e. such capsules are conventionally made up of two parts telescopically pushed together leaving an associated seam) and the fine structures of any seam or

elements of the capsule appear to be smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees (i.e. these are conditions met by a simple capsule that is manufactured within close tolerances). Furthermore, any fine structures of any seam would have a plurality of elevations associated therewith, even the smallest of fine structures would have a plurality of elevations depending on what scale or fine measurement the elevations are measured in.

In regard to claim 22, the elevations are in the form of an annular rib formed by the interface created by the two parts of the capsule telescopically pushed together).

If Applicant takes issue over the capsule being manufactured within close tolerances such that elements formed on the capsule surface which are smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees, the seam being offset from center 0 to 12% of an outer longitudinal length of the capsule, or a tolerance and inaccuracy deviating from the symmetry of up to 0.15 mm in each case, Examiner has included an alternative rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,6-13,16 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohki et al. (US 5,715,811).

The Ohki et al. reference discloses an inhaler apparatus (see FIG. 8) that works based on the Bernoulli effect or principle (i.e. venturi effect) including an upper chamber (proximate reference numeral 1 in FIG. 8) and a lower housing part 6 with a capsule chamber (proximate reference numeral 7 in FIG. 8) having a cutting device 14 with spikes 16 and air inlet openings 8 and air outlet openings 8C to conduct a powder composition contained within capsule 17. The capsule 17 (see FIG.8 and FIG. 7) appears to be a symmetrical capsule made up of two parts telescopically pushed together (i.e. such capsules are conventionally made up of two parts telescopically pushed together leaving an associated seam) and the fine structures of any seam or elements of the capsule appear to be smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees (i.e. these are conditions met by a simple capsule that is manufactured within close tolerances). Furthermore, any fine structures of any seam would have a plurality of elevations associated therewith, even the smallest of fine structures would have a plurality of elevations depending on what scale or fine measurement the elevations are measured in. However, the Ohki et al. reference fails to explicitly disclose *the capsule being manufactured within close tolerances such that elements formed on the capsule surface which are smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees, the seam being offset from center 0 to 12% of an outer longitudinal length of the capsule, or a tolerance and inaccuracy deviating from the symmetry of up to 0.15 mm in each case*. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have *the capsule being manufactured within close tolerances such that elements formed on the capsule surface which are smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up*

to 5 degrees, the seam being offset from center 0 to 12% of an outer longitudinal length of the capsule, or a tolerance and inaccuracy deviating from the symmetry of up to 0.15 mm in each case, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

In regard to claim 22, the elevations are in the form of an annular rib formed by the interface created by the two parts of the capsule telescopically pushed together).

Claims 1,6-16 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hochrainer et al. (US 5,947,118).

The Hochrainer et al. reference discloses an inhaler apparatus (see FIG. 6) that works based on the Bernoulli effect or principle (i.e. venturi effect) comprising a cup shaped lower part open at (6) hinged to cap 15, a plate 8, a button 10 movable counter to a spring 11 and including spikes (unlabeled in FIG. 6). The inhaler apparatus further includes a capsule chamber accommodating a capsule (unlabeled in FIG. 6) and a magazine with a plurality of chambers 1 shown on plate 8. The capsule (see FIG. 6) appears to be a symmetrical capsule made up of two parts telescopically pushed together (i.e. such capsules are conventionally made up of two parts telescopically pushed together leaving an associated seam) and the fine structures of any seam or elements of the capsule appear to be smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees (i.e. these are conditions met by a simple capsule that is manufactured within close tolerances). Furthermore, any fine structures of any seam would have a plurality of elevations associated

therewith, even the smallest of fine structures would have a plurality of elevations depending on what scale or fine measurement the elevations are measured in. However, the Hochrainer et al. reference fails to explicitly disclose *the capsule being manufactured within close tolerances such that elements formed on the capsule surface which are smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees, the seam being offset from center 0 to 12% of an outer longitudinal length of the capsule, or a tolerance and inaccuracy deviating from the symmetry of up to 0.15 mm in each case*. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have *the capsule being manufactured within close tolerances such that elements formed on the capsule surface which are smaller than 0.1 mm and/or angles of taper up to 5 degrees, the seam being offset from center 0 to 12% of an outer longitudinal length of the capsule, or a tolerance and inaccuracy deviating from the symmetry of up to 0.15 mm in each case*, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

In regard to claim 22, the elevations are in the form of an annular rib formed by the interface created by the two parts of the capsule telescopically pushed together).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,6-16 and 18-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Steven O. Douglas/ whose telephone number is (571) 272-4885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 6:30-5:00.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven O. Douglas/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3771

SD
2/5/10